

		<p>July 1, 2008 10:30 am – 12:30 pm</p> <p>Caltrans Dept of Veteran Affairs Building 1227 O Street, Room 518 (5th floor) Sacramento, CA 95814</p> <p>Contact: Abhijit Bagde (916) 654-3638</p>	
		<p>Meeting called by: Muhaned Aljabiry Facilitator: Abhijit Bagde Recorder/Time Keeper: Penny Gray</p>	
		Agenda Topics	
Item	Description	Time	Presenter
1	Topics/Agenda/Introductions	10:30	Abhijit Bagde
2	Ground Rules	10:35	Abhijit Bagde
3	Approval of the 05/20/08 CFPG meeting minutes	10:40	Abhijit Bagde
4	Announcements and updates <ul style="list-style-type: none"> CTIPS Training – Abhijit Bagde FHWA Resource Center is offering training the week of September 15 on Congestion and Operations. Also “in-person” training on the Financial Template is available upon request - Steve Luxenberg 	10:45	All
5	Follow-Up Items from last meeting: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inclusion of Emission Benefits field in CTIPS – Caltrans will coordinate meeting with Local Assistance – Item completed, see Item No. 11 below John Taylor will provide additional information regarding estimates of Federal funds to help MPOs address issues regarding future year rescissions – Item completed Webinar on FHWA Cost Template – if interested, please e-mail Steve Luxenberg with the requested date by May 22 – Item completed Comments on the draft Amendment Modification Guidelines report are due back to Jose Luis by May 30 Caltrans will be scheduling a meeting with FTA regarding EPSP within the next couple of weeks Send comments on the SHSP action items to Ken Kochevar, FHWA by May 30 	10:50	Caltrans
6	2009 FSTIP Schedule – Update	10:55	Muhaned Aljabiry
7	2009 FTIPs: Include following information in final FTIPs <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Total Project cost, the cost estimates must use an inflation rate(s) to reflect “year of expenditure dollars” based on reasonable financial principals RTP project/Page Number for projects Expedited Project selection Procedures 	11:05	Abhijit Bagde
8	Task Force Discussions – Update	11:15	José Luis Cáceres/Sri Srinivasan/ Muhaned Aljabiry

9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Programming of carry over apportionments • Change the current requirement of developing FTIP every two years 	11:45	Sri Srinivasan
10	Transportation Planning Requirements and their relationship to NEPA approvals (Handout 1)	12:00	Abhijit Bagde /FHWA
11	Inclusion of Emission Benefits field in CTIPS and discussion of meeting with CT- Local Assistance	12:10	Muhaned Aljabiry
12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Follow-Up Items • Open Forum • Future Agenda Items 	12:20	All
13	Future meeting dates and locations: August 12 – MTC, Oakland (10:30 am – 12:30 pm) September 30 – SACOG, Sacramento (10:30 am – 12:30 pm) November 18 – FHWA, Sacramento (10:30 am – 12:30 pm) January 6, 2009 – Caltrans, Sacramento (10:30 am – 12:30 pm)	12:25	All

CALIFORNIA FEDERAL PROGRAMMING GROUP (CFPG)
MEETING MINUTES –July 1, 2008

The CFPG meeting was held at Caltrans in the Veteran's Affairs Building, 1227 O Street, Room 518, Sacramento, from 10:30 a.m. to 12:30 p.m.

1. Topics/Agenda/Introduction:

The meeting started with the self-introduction of attendees.

2. Ground Rules:

Abhijit Bagde, Caltrans, Federal Programming, gave a brief overview of ground rules for the meeting. Here are the full ground rules:

- Since there are phone participants, everyone who speaks should state his/her name and agency.
- Keep comments as brief as possible.
- Stick to the current agenda item. Additional items not in the agenda will be added to the end and will be discussed if time permits.
- Turn off cell phones and limit interruptions.
- This is a forum to hear everyone's concerns, comments and suggestions. Please make sure your voice is heard.
- Facilitator to ask before moving on to the next item if anyone on the phone has any additional comments on the item, then pause for a few seconds.
- Respond to follow-up items and meeting notices by the deadlines.
- Except for follow-up items, the minutes will include discussions that take place during the meeting only. If you do not want what you say during the meeting included in the minutes, state "off the record."
- When not speaking, phone participants to keep their phones on mute if possible.
- Do not place conference call on hold. Please hang up and redial if you must take another call.

3. Approval of 5/20/08 CFPG meeting minutes:

The meeting minutes for May 20, 2008, were approved with no changes.

4. Announcements and updates:

- CTIPS Training – A one-day training course on CTIPS is being developed. Final arrangements are still pending, but Caltrans will try to schedule the training in conjunction with a CFPG meeting. Additional details will be provided as they become available.
- Congestion and Operations Training – The FHWA Resource Center is offering training the week of September 15.
- Financial Template Training – FHWA conducted a webinar training session on financial templates. Due to technical difficulties with the webinar, FHWA will offer "in-person" training upon request. FHWA will also conduct an additional webinar if needed. Please contact Steve Luxenberg by July 11 to request the training.

- 2008 Discretionary Awards for Public Lands Highway, Ferry Boat, and Interstate Maintenance are listed on the following FHWA website:
<http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/new.html>
- HSIP Cycle 2 Projects – Caltrans Local Assistance has requested these projects be amended into the 2009 FSTIP as soon as possible – if possible as the 2009 FSTIP is being developed or in the first amendment to the 2009 FSTIP. The website for these projects is:
http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LocalPrograms/HSIP/prev_cycle_results.htm
- Conformity Training – FHWA is preparing a 1-2 day conformity workshop in Sacramento in September. The training will be able to accommodate approximately 35 people. Please let Joe Vaughn, (Joseph.Vaughn@fhwa.dot.gov) know if you are interested in attending. An announcement for the workshop should be available next week.

5. Follow-Up Items from last meeting:

A.	Inclusion of Emission Benefits field in CTIPS - Completed. For now, this information will not be contained in CTIPS. Local agencies must provide the emission benefits information to Caltrans Local Assistance at the time of project authorization. See Item 11.
B.	Comments on Draft Amendment Guidelines – If you have additional comments, please submit to Jose Luis Caceras, SACOG.
C.	Caltrans will schedule a meeting with FTA regarding EPSP within the next couple of weeks – Pending.
D.	Send comments on the SHSP action items to Ken Kochevar, FHWA by May 30. Ken is still accepting comments.

6. 2009 FSTIP Schedule - Update:

Most MPOs have started the public review process for their 2009 FTIPs. Caltrans is still proceeding with the following schedule:

Board Approved FTIPs due to Caltrans August 1, 2008

Public Review of the FSTIP will be for 30 days beginning approximately September 1, 2008

FSTIP submittal to FHWA for review and approval beginning October 1, 2008

FSTIP approval by FHWA/FTA anticipated by November 1, 2008.

EPA has not yet approved the 2007 PM 10 Maintenance Plan which contains the new PM 10 conformity budget for the San Joaquin Valley (SJV) MPOs. EPA has not made a concurrent adequacy finding determination on the conformity budget in the SJV 8-Hour Ozone Plan and the Eastern Kern 8-Hour Ozone Plan. These emission budgets are necessary for the development of air quality conforming 2009 FTIPs. Due to recent exceedances, it is doubtful that EPA will release these emission budgets by July 31. The SJV MPOs have prepared interim FTIPs consisting of exempt projects, which will likely be adopted as the 2009 FTIP. To minimize the impact of the interim FTIPs, the SJV MPOs may prepare an amendment to the 2009 FTIPs that will add projects that can proceed based on a previous emission analysis. It is anticipated that this

amendment will be processed in December 2008. A full conforming FTIP cannot be developed until the new conformity budgets are available.

7. 2009 FTIPs: Include the Following Information in Final FTIPs

There were several items that were consistently missing from the draft FTIPs:

- Total project cost in the project listings, and financial principles related to year of expenditure dollars in the Financial Plan.
- RTP Project No./Page Number for projects
- Expedited Project Selection Procedures
- Financial Template must be submitted to Caltrans electronically in excel format
- Detailed Project Listings for Lump Sum projects (note: for non FTA projects, these back up lists do not have to be part of the public review package)
- Systems Level Estimates of Revenues and Costs needed to Operate and Maintain Regional Transit Systems and Federal Aid Eligible highway Systems

Please refer to the 2009 FTIP Development Guidance posted at the link below:
http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/transprog/federal/fedfiles/2009_ftip_chklst_guidance_053008.pdf

8. Task Force Discussions - Update:

The task force will continue meeting to explore various options and components for proposed changes to the Amendment Modification Guidelines. FHWA and the State explored the option of revising the current guidelines to allow the lesser of 25 percent or \$4M rather than the existing 20 percent or \$2M. FHWA has provided additional language to the proposal. The State determined that this additional language should be part of the task force discussion and not as part of the revision to the existing guidelines. Therefore, the existing guidelines will not be revised.

Sue Kaiser will be meeting with FHWA Headquarters in August to discuss financial constraint. She will bring up our concerns related to Administrative Modifications as well as programming carry over apportionments.

The Best Practices task force is continuing to accept comments on the Amendment Checklist. Muhaned would like to encourage everyone to submit recommendations for improvement or streamlining our current processes and practices.

9. Programming of Carry Over Apportionments/Change the Current Requirement of Developing FTIP every Two Years:

There was continued discussion on the authority to program carryover apportionments, and to program above the annual apportionment level of a specific fund type while programming less than the annual apportionment level in another type of fund. For example, an agency may have a large project that requires more CMAQ funds than are available on an annual basis. The MPO would like the ability to program above the annual apportionment level in CMAQ to accommodate this type of project. The MPO would also under program another type of fund such as RSTP in the same year, resulting in a net sum zero change for total programmed. The MPO would still be

financially constrained based on the available OA, but not by fund source by year. Another example involves deobligations. When a project is deobligated, both apportionments and OA are returned. However, programming capacity is not increased. This is because California programs up to the annual apportionment level and not the OA level, and thus is already allowed a percentage increase for adjustments. Sue Kaiser will discuss these issues with FHWA Headquarters in August (see 8 above).

Pete Hathaway, SACOG, is participating in the Consensus Group for the Transportation Reauthorization Act. The State is proposing a five-year FSTIP rather than a four-year FSTIP. As a result, do we want to propose a change to the update cycle from two years to four years? Additional discussion on this proposal as well as recommendations to change the update time period will be considered after the 2009 FSTIP is approved.

10. Transportation Planning Requirements and their relationship to NEPA approval (Handout 1):

No additional discussion.

11. Inclusion of Emission Benefits field in CTIPS and discussion of meeting with CT-Local Assistance:

Caltrans (CT) Federal Programming Office met with CT Local Assistance regarding the request to include the emission benefits field in CTIPS. If the field were included in CTIPS, it would be a mandatory field. This information may not always be available at the time of programming and may cause difficulties programming the project in CTIPS. Programming will continue to work with MPOs and CT Local Assistance to get a better idea of when and how this information must/needs to be provided. For now, local agencies must continue the current process of providing emission benefits numbers at the time of authorization request.

12. Follow Up Items, Open Forum, Future Agenda Items:

Follow Up Items:

- FHWA Webinar on Financial Templates – Please respond to Steve Luxenberg by July 11 if you want to request an additional webinar.
- Conformity Training – Please respond to Joe Vaughn, FHWA, (Joseph.Vaughn@fhwa.dot.gov) if interested in attending.
- Website link for 2008 Discretionary Projects – Caltrans to forward link to CFPG members.

Open Forum

- Question regarding total project cost – This should be a single number based on the RTP costs for each phase.
- Aimee Kratovil will be acting for Steve Luxenberg the last 2 weeks of July.
- FTA Section 5309 Discretionary Funds – Caltrans will follow up with Ted Matley regarding programming of future year funds.

Future Agenda Items

- Emergency Relief Funds, Emergency Opening, Emergency Repair, Rural Safety Enhancement Program
- **Meeting dates and locations for Future Meetings**
 - August 12 – MTC, Oakland (10:30 am – 12:30 pm)
 - September 30 – SACOG, Sacramento (10:30 am – 12:30 pm)
 - November 18 – FHWA, Sacramento (10:30 am – 12:30 pm)
 - January 6, 2009 – Caltrans, Sacramento (10:30 am – 12:30 pm)



HANDOUT 1

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION
CALIFORNIA DIVISION
650 Capitol Mall, Suite 4-100
Sacramento, CA. 95814
February 12, 2008

IN REPLY REFER TO
Document #: S51409

Mr. Will Kempton, Director
California Department of Transportation
1120 N Street
Sacramento, CA 95814

Attention: Federal Resources Office, Room 3500
For Garth Hopkins, Office of Regional and Interagency Planning

Dear Mr. Kempton:

SUBJECT: Transportation Planning Requirements and their Relationship to NEPA Approvals

The Federal Highway Administration recently issued the enclosed guidance to clarify transportation planning requirements. This new guidance allows more flexibility regarding when a project must be fully funded in the Metropolitan / Regional Transportation Plan.

Project sponsors may undertake the NEPA process with federal funds for a project or corridor that is included in the Metropolitan Transportation Plan as a project, corridor study, or NEPA study. However, in order for FHWA (or Caltrans under NEPA assignment) to sign the ROD, FONSI, or approve the CE and make a project level conformity determination, as applicable, all project phases planned within the life of the transportation plan have to be included in the fiscally constrained MTP.

By allowing environmental work to proceed up until the time of the ROD, FONSI, or CE approval as long as the project is reflected in the MTP as a project, corridor study or NEPA study, it allows the project sponsor additional time to identify reasonably available funding sources for the actual construction of the project. This flexibility may also attract more private investors and may lead to more Public Private Partnerships, since many private investors are reluctant to make financial commitments during the early NEPA process.

If you have any questions, please contact your FHWA MPO coordinator.

Sincerely,

/s/ K. Sue Kiser

For
Gene K. Fong
Division Administrator

Enclosure

MOVING THE
AMERICAN
ECONOMY



cc: (e-mail)

PAQT

All MPOs

Caltrans:

Muhaned Aljabiry

Cindy Adams

Transportation Planning Requirements and Their Relationship to NEPA Process Completion (1/28/2008)

Background

This summary is intended to clarify the statutory and regulatory planning and conformity requirements that must be met with regard to the STIP/TIP, the Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP), and the Statewide Long Range Transportation Plan (SLRTP) prior to FHWA signing a Record of Decision (ROD) or Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI), or approving a Categorical Exclusion (CE) for a project. Project sponsors may undertake the NEPA process with federal funds for a project or corridor that is included in the Metropolitan Transportation Plan as a project, corridor study, or NEPA study, if appropriate (some non-regionally significant projects may not need to be in the MTP) (23 CFR 450.324(g)). In the case of the SLRTP, the project, corridor, or NEPA study should be consistent with the SLRTP before proceeding with the NEPA process (23 CFR 450.216(k)). For federally funded NEPA studies, the STIP/TIP shall contain an item for NEPA and/or PE activity costs for the project prior to the authorization/obligation of federal funds to start the NEPA process. If a proposed NEPA study is not in the MTP (in metropolitan planning areas), consistent with the SLRTP (in non metropolitan planning areas), and contained in the STIP/TIP, only funds from non-federal sources can be used to conduct the NEPA process. Regardless of funding sources, the ROD, FONSI, or CE for a project can not be signed or approved by FHWA until the planning requirements described in the Q and A's listed below are met.

Questions and Answers

1. What statutory and regulatory planning requirements and conformity requirements must be completed regarding a proposed project before a ROD or FONSI can be signed, or a CE approved, *for a project in a Metropolitan area*?

Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) Requirements: Regulations require that the entire project described in the ROD, FONSI, or CE shall be consistent with the MTP. If phases (e.g., PE, final design, ROW, utility relocation, construction, and/or construction phases) of the project fall beyond the life of the MTP, they do not have to be included, however it is recommended that those phases (e.g., PE, final design, ROW, utility relocation, construction, and/or construction phases) beyond the life of the plan and the costs associated with those phases be referenced in the plan for informational purposes. All project phases (e.g., PE, final design, ROW, utility relocation, construction, and/or construction phases) planned within the life of the transportation plan have to be included in the fiscally constrained MTP in order for FHWA to sign the ROD, FONSI or approve the CE. In the event that there is construction phasing and "multiple or revised RODs" (for independent segments) of a larger project, FHWA can only sign the ROD, FONSI, or approve the CE for those segments of the project that have independent utility and logical termini, while contributing to the function of the overall project, and are included in the MPO's fiscally constrained MTP. The timing of this phasing (construction phases for independent segments) in the MTP should be consistent with

the timing of the phasing (construction phases for independent segments) of the future project implementation as described in the environmental document. Examples are given in the attachment to this document. The MTP must be approved by the MPO policy board, found to conform for air quality purposes (if applicable), and fiscally constrained. The MTP must demonstrate that revenues are reasonably expected to be available and sufficient to cover the costs of the entire project (all phases) (e.g., PE, final design, ROW, utility relocation, construction, and/or construction phases) that are included in the plan.

STIP/TIP Requirements: The planning regulations require that before FHWA can sign a ROD or FONSI, or approve a CE for a regionally significant project, the proposed project or a phase(s) (e.g., PE, final design, ROW, utility relocation, or construction, and/or construction phase(s)) of the project must come from an approved, financially constrained STIP/TIP. This is required because the final Planning Rule requires that both the STIP and TIP shall contain all regionally significant projects requiring an action by FHWA or FTA irrespective of the project's funding source (23 CFR 450.324(d); 23 CFR 450.216(h)). In order for FHWA to sign a ROD or FONSI, or approve a CE for a project or phase (e.g., PE, final design, ROW, utility relocation, construction, and/or construction phases) of a project with logical termini and independent utility (see CFR 771.111(f)), the STIP/TIP is required to show all phases (e.g., PE, final design, ROW, utility relocation, construction, and/or construction phases) of the project that are planned within the time frame of the STIP/TIP. This can include or be limited to non-construction funding (e.g., PE, final design, ROW, utilities relocation) and/or construction or construction phases if there are phases (e.g., PE, final design, ROW, utility relocation, construction, and/or construction phases) of the project that are planned beyond the horizon of the STIP/TIP. Those phases (e.g., PE, final design, ROW, utility relocation, construction, and/or construction phases) of the project beyond the horizon of the STIP/TIP do not have to be shown in the STIP/TIP. At least one subsequent phase (e.g., PE, final design, ROW, utility relocation, or construction) of the project has to be included in the approved STIP/TIP before FHWA can sign the ROD or FONSI or approve a CE. For example, the STIP/TIP might include final design, but not construction, if the construction phase is not planned within the horizon of the STIP/TIP. The timing of these subsequent phase(s) (e.g., PE, final design, ROW, utility relocation, construction, or construction phases) should be consistent with the MTP and the environmental document. In those unusual instances where no subsequent (subsequent to NEPA approval) phases (e.g., PE, final design, ROW, utility relocation, construction, or construction phases) of the project fall within the timeframe of the STIP/TIP, then a description of the project should be included in the STIP/TIP for informational purposes and identified as being beyond the horizon of the STIP/TIP. An example of including subsequent phases of a project in a STIP/TIP is included in the attachment to this document.

Conformity Requirements: Before a ROD or FONSI can be signed, or a CE approved, regulations require that a project level conformity determination shall be made for all projects that are subject to transportation conformity. Project level conformity can be demonstrated if the project is part of a conforming metropolitan transportation plan and TIP and meets all project level conformity requirements (see 40 CFR 93.104(d); 40 CFR 93.109). See also, http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/conformity/feis_rod.htm.

In the event that a “multiple ROD” approach is used, a project-level conformity determination must be completed prior to the signing of each ROD. The portion of the “overall project” being addressed by each ROD must be consistent with what was included in the regional emissions analysis for the MPO MTP and TIP (i.e., the design concept and scope of the project included in the conforming transportation plan cannot be significantly different from what was included in the environmental document). Project level conformity can be demonstrated if the project is part of a conforming metropolitan transportation plan and TIP and meets all project level conformity requirements (see 40 CFR 93.104(d); 40 CFR 93.109). Additionally, the financial plan supporting the MPO MTP and TIP must reflect the portions(s) of the “overall project” prior to the approval of each ROD.

2. What planning and conformity requirements must be completed regarding a proposed project before a ROD or FONSI can be signed, or a CE approved *for a project that is in a rural area*?

Statewide Long Range Transportation Plan Requirements: Before FHWA can sign a ROD/FONSI, or approve a CE, a project in a rural area must be found to be consistent with the Statewide Long Range Transportation Plan. The Planning Regulations allow Statewide Transportation plans to be policy plans and not project specific. In such cases, the project does not have to be specifically listed in the plan but should be consistent with the overall goals and objectives of the Statewide Plan. The Statewide Transportation Plan, by regulation, does not have to be fiscally constrained.

STIP Requirements: Before FHWA can sign a ROD or FONSI, or approve a CE for a regionally significant project, the proposed project or a phase (e.g., PE, final design, ROW, utility relocation, or construction) of the project must come from an approved, financially constrained STIP. The planning regulation requires that the STIP shall contain all regionally significant projects requiring an action by FHWA or FTA irrespective of the project’s funding source (23 CFR 450.324(d); 23 CFR 450.216(h)). In order for FHWA to sign a ROD or FONSI, or approve a CE for a project or phase of a project with logical termini and independent utility (see CFR 771.111(f)), the STIP is required to show all phases (e.g. PE, final design, ROW, utilities relocation, or construction) of the project that are planned within the 4 year time frame of the STIP. This can include or be limited to non-construction funding (e.g., PE, final design, ROW, utilities relocation) if there are phases of the project that are planned beyond the 4 year horizon of the STIP. Those phases of the project beyond the 4-year horizon of the STIP do not have to be shown in the STIP. At least one subsequent phase of the project does have to be included in the approved STIP before FHWA can sign the ROD or FONSI or approve a CE. For example, the STIP might include final design, but not construction. The timing of these subsequent phases should be consistent with the SLRTP and the environmental document (if it is a regionally significant project). In those unusual instances where no subsequent (subsequent to NEPA approval) phases of the project fall within the timeframe of the STIP, then a description of the project should be included in the STIP for informational purposes and identified as being beyond the horizon of the STIP/TIP.

Conformity Requirements: The conformity regulations require that before FHWA signs a ROD/FONSI or approves a CE for a project that is in a nonattainment or maintenance area, the project must be found to be in conformity (see 40 CFR 93.104(d); 40 CFR 93.109). In nonattainment and maintenance areas, for a project in a “donut”¹ area, the project must be included in a regional emissions analysis that supported the conformity determination of the associated metropolitan transportation plan and TIP and meet all applicable project level conformity requirements before a project level conformity determination can be made. See 40 CFR 93.104(d); 40 CFR 93.109.

In isolated rural nonattainment and maintenance areas² a project level conformity determination must meet all the requirements in 40 CFR 109(l) prior to FHWA signing a ROD or FONSI or FHWA approval of a CE.

¹ A “donut” area is a geographic area outside a metropolitan planning area boundary, but inside the boundary of a nonattainment or maintenance area that contains any part of a metropolitan area(s). These areas are not isolated rural nonattainment and maintenance areas.

² Isolated rural nonattainment and maintenance areas are areas that do not contain or are not part of any metropolitan planning area as designated under the transportation planning regulations. Isolated rural areas do not have federally required metropolitan transportation plans or TIPs and do not have projects that are part of the emissions analysis of any MPO’s metropolitan transportation plan or TIP. Projects in such areas are instead included in a statewide transportation improvement program. These areas are not donut areas. (40 CFR 93.101).

Project examples regarding fiscal constraint and NEPA approvals

The following are project examples that highlight some scenarios where Divisions encountered challenges with fiscal constraint issues with pending, active or concluding NEPA processes. These examples are not included here to suggest that fiscal constraint issues can only be dealt with using the remedies described. Each project will have its own unique context. As a best-practice approach, fiscal constraint issues should be considered throughout the planning and NEPA processes, and if any issues are encountered, they should be considered before the NEPA process is initiated and addressed long before NEPA approval is considered.

Intercounty Connector (ICC), Maryland

Example of securing additional funding from new sources early in NEPA process

The ICC is a \$2.4 billion project in Maryland, just north of Washington, DC. The project was not in the metropolitan transportation plan (MTP) at the time NEPA was initiated. Early in the process, it was recognized by FHWA and the State Highway Administration that the estimated cost of the project, and competing priorities in the region, would present challenges to demonstrating fiscal constraint by inclusion of the project in the MTP. Early in the NEPA process, a decision was made (for both fiscal and operational reasons) to explore tolling as an aspect of the alternatives being evaluated. The revenues from tolling enabled FHWA and SHA to address the fiscal issues, and the ICC was added successfully to the fiscally constrained MTP, and the ROD signed in May 2006. For more information, contact Marlys Osterhues, 202-366-2052.

I-25 Valley Highway, Colorado

Example of using a “phased decision-making” approach to address fiscal constraint issues

It was recognized early on in the NEPA process that the planning requirements regarding fiscal constraint must be satisfied prior to FHWA approving a ROD. Total funding for the entire project would not be available at the time the ROD was to be signed. Because the fiscally-constrained MTP did not contain the entire Preferred Alternative for the Valley Highway project, FHWA and Colorado DOT determined that it was appropriate to identify a phased project implementation process. The Draft and Final EIS discussed a phased implementation approach and presented six logical project phases. Phased implementation was discussed with the public and agencies. FHWA and CDOT identified a set of criteria to be used as guidelines in establishing independent project phases, which included, but were not limited to, logical termini and independent utility, contributing to accomplishing elements of the over all project purpose and need, and fiscal constraint (demonstrated by inclusion in the MTP). The phases of the project were included in the RTP before the ROD was approved in June 2007 on Segments 1 and 2.

For more information, contact Keith Moore, 202-366-0524.

I-83 Master Plan, Pennsylvania

Example of consideration of fiscal issues and project phasing in planning studies

The I-83 Master Plan, prepared by the PennDOT in 2003, is a transportation planning study to identify, plan, and program future transportation improvement projects for an 11 mile section of I-83. The entire

corridor upgrade is estimated to cost at least \$1.5 billion. It was immediately clear that construction could not take place simultaneously on the entire corridor, in part because fiscal constraints would reduce the ability to fully fund all required projects at one time. Upon review and analysis of constructability and safety issues, the corridor was divided into four sections that could be funded through the MPO, advanced through PennDOT's project development process, and designed and constructed independently. Each section has both logical termini and independent utility. The corridor will have four independent (but related) environmental processes. Although a NEPA analysis is currently being conducted for the first phase of the study (I-83 East Shore Section 1 Project), this project provides an example of the consideration of phasing and fiscal constraint issues early, in pre-NEPA planning studies.

For more information, contact Spencer Stevens, 202-366-0149.

Project example regarding including subsequent phases of a project in the STIP and/or TIP

The following example shows how subsequent phases (subsequent to NEPA) of a regionally significant project were shown in the TIP (and STIP). The project is also included in the Philadelphia area MPO's (DVRPC) MTP. This example also shows construction funding that is outside of the 4-year horizon of the TIP for the project but the TIP still includes it for information purposes in later years. For more information, please contact Spencer Stevens, 202-366-0149.

State Route 309 Project, Pennsylvania

Example of subsequent project phases (subsequent to NEPA) included in a STIP/TIP (continues on the next two pages).

DVRPC FY 2007-2010 TIP for PA

Final Version

Pennsylvania - Highway Program

Montgomery

MPMS# 16438 PA 309 Connector Project

AQ Code 2020M PA 309 to PA 63, Sumneytown Pike

Major SOV Capacity New/Upgraded Connector Roadway

Subcom(s): 2A, 11A, Hatfield Township; Franconia Township; Lower Salford Township; Towamencin Township
14C

Provide an adequate two lane roadway connection by upgrading two existing two lane roads (Wambold Rd. and Township Line Rd.) and connecting them with a two lane roadway approximately one mile in length. This project will correct the disjointed and inadequate road system serving the north/south movement between PA 309 and the PA Turnpike Lansdale Interchange. This project will proceed in 2 phases.

The Right-Sized Phase 1 Project includes the proposed realignment of Sumneytown Pike (PA 63) from Old Forty Foot Road to Freed Road and improvements to Wambold Road from Sumneytown Pike (PA 63) to Allentown Road. The proposed work includes a three lane relocation of PA 63 with shoulders (11' lanes and 8' shoulders) on Wambold Road and a two lane runaround around Mainland Village.

This project is integral to the Delaware Valley Freight Corridors Initiative.

SAFETEA DEMO #613 - \$1.280 MILLION

Phase	Fund	TIP Program Years (\$ 000)				Later FYs
		FY2007	FY2008	FY2009	FY2010	
FD	HWY	2,240				
FD	H-STATE	560				
FD	HWY		400			
FD	H-STATE		100			
ROW	HWY		480			
ROW	DEMO		1,280			
ROW	H-STATE		120			
ROW	H-STATE		120			
CON	SSPIKE		4,000			
CON	SPIKE		16,000			
CON	HWY					36,000
CON	H-STATE					9,000
Fiscal Year Total		2,800	22,500	0	0	45,000
		Total FY 07-10				25,300

Construction funding outside timeframe of TIP, but included for information

2030 Major Regional Transportation Projects

NO	FACILITY	LIMITS	BRIEF DESCRIPTION	TIME PERIOD					LOCATION	NJ	COST \$MILLIONS
				2006 - 2010	2011 - 2020	2021 - 2030	BUCKS	CHESTER			
1	US 422	in Bucks County	Reconstruct	X	X	X					\$545.0
2	US 422	Bucks County line to Saratoga	Reconstruct	X	X	X					210.0
3	US 1	Baltimore Pike to Maryland State line	Reconstruct	X	X	X					200.0
4	US 30 (Downingtown/Conowingo Bypass)	PA 10 to Eaton Bypass	Reconstruct	X	X	X					181.5
5	US 1 (Media Bypass)	I-476 to Baltimore Pike	Reconstruct	X	X	X					200.0
6	I-476 (Blue Route)	PA Turnpike to Delaware County line	Reconstruct	X	X	X					70.0
7	PA 309	Greenwood Ave to Webb Rd	Reconstruct	X	X	X					280.0
8	I-295	in Philadelphia	Reconstruct (see also 61)	X	X	X					500.0
9	I-295	US 1 to I-195 and CR 561 to CR 607	Reconstruct	X	X	X					89.0
10	NJ 42 Freeway	I-295 to Atlantic City Expressway	Reconstruct	X	X	X					15.0
HIGHWAY SAFETY/OPERATIONAL IMPROVEMENTS											
11	PA 113 Heritage Corridor	Schuylkill River to PA 611	Intersection and Corridor Improvements		X	X					\$25.0
12	PA 113	PA 611 to Delaware River	Access Management Improvements		X	X					25.0
13	US 13	Livestock Parkway to Philadelphia line	Access Management & Corridor Improvements		X	X					30.0
14	Street Rd	at I-95 Interchange	Reconstruct Interchange		X	X					5.3
15	Unimod Rd	Old Lincoln Highway to I-95 Interchange	Reconstruct Interchange		X	X					6.0
16	PA 52	PA 826 to US 1	Add Center Turn Lane		X	X					10.0
17	US 30, PA 82, and Train Station	within Coatesville Redevelopment Area	Reconstruct Interchange & Extend Bridge		X	X					40.0
18	I-476	at I-476 and Chestnut St On-Ramp	Reconstruct Interchange		X	X					15.0
19	I-476	at I-476 and Chestnut St On-Ramp	Reconstruct Interchange		X	X					25.0
20	Wedge Mill	at I-476 and Chestnut St On-Ramp	Reconstruct Interchange		X	X					25.0
21	US 202 Sec. 500 (Market St)	at I-476 and Chestnut St On-Ramp	Reconstruct Interchange		X	X					25.0
22	US 202 Sec. 500 (Market St)	at I-476 and Chestnut St On-Ramp	Reconstruct Interchange		X	X					25.0
23	US 202 Sec. 500 (Market St)	at I-476 and Chestnut St On-Ramp	Reconstruct Interchange		X	X					25.0
24	US 202 Sec. 500 (Market St)	at I-476 and Chestnut St On-Ramp	Reconstruct Interchange		X	X					25.0
25	US 202 Sec. 500 (Market St)	at I-476 and Chestnut St On-Ramp	Reconstruct Interchange		X	X					25.0
26	US 202 Sec. 500 (Market St)	at I-476 and Chestnut St On-Ramp	Reconstruct Interchange		X	X					25.0
27	US 202 Sec. 500 (Market St)	at I-476 and Chestnut St On-Ramp	Reconstruct Interchange		X	X					25.0
28	US 202 Sec. 500 (Market St)	at I-476 and Chestnut St On-Ramp	Reconstruct Interchange		X	X					25.0
29	US 202 Sec. 500 (Market St)	at I-476 and Chestnut St On-Ramp	Reconstruct Interchange		X	X					25.0
30	US 202 Sec. 500 (Market St)	at I-476 and Chestnut St On-Ramp	Reconstruct Interchange		X	X					25.0
HIGHWAY NEW CAPACITY											
31	I-476 PA Turnpike Northeast Extension	Lansdale to Allentown	Widen to 6 Lanes	X	X	X					\$ 20.0
32	US 202 Sec. 200	Monroeville to Doylestown	Construct New Parkway and Improve Intersections	X	X	X					200.0
33	County Line Road	PA 309 to PA 611	Widen Reconstruct	X	X	X					30.0
34	I-95	at I-276 (PA Turnpike)	Construct New Interchange and Delaware R. Bridge Widen	X	X	X					15.0
35	I-95 at Scoudenville Falls Bridge	PA 322 to CR 179	Widen	X	X	X					0.0
36	I-95 at Scoudenville Falls Bridge	PA 322 to CR 179	Widen	X	X	X					0.0
37	I-95 at Scoudenville Falls Bridge	PA 322 to CR 179	Widen	X	X	X					0.0
38	I-95 at Scoudenville Falls Bridge	PA 322 to CR 179	Widen	X	X	X					0.0
39	I-95 at Scoudenville Falls Bridge	PA 322 to CR 179	Widen	X	X	X					0.0
40	I-95 at Scoudenville Falls Bridge	PA 322 to CR 179	Widen	X	X	X					0.0
41	I-95 at Scoudenville Falls Bridge	PA 322 to CR 179	Widen	X	X	X					0.0
42	I-95 at Scoudenville Falls Bridge	PA 322 to CR 179	Widen	X	X	X					0.0
43	I-95 at Scoudenville Falls Bridge	PA 322 to CR 179	Widen	X	X	X					0.0
44	I-95 at Scoudenville Falls Bridge	PA 322 to CR 179	Widen	X	X	X					0.0
45	I-95 at Scoudenville Falls Bridge	PA 322 to CR 179	Widen	X	X	X					0.0
46	I-95 at Scoudenville Falls Bridge	PA 322 to CR 179	Widen	X	X	X					0.0
47	I-95 at Scoudenville Falls Bridge	PA 322 to CR 179	Widen	X	X	X					0.0
48	I-95 at Scoudenville Falls Bridge	PA 322 to CR 179	Widen	X	X	X					0.0
49	I-95 at Scoudenville Falls Bridge	PA 322 to CR 179	Widen	X	X	X					0.0
50	I-95 at Scoudenville Falls Bridge	PA 322 to CR 179	Widen	X	X	X					0.0
51	I-95 at Scoudenville Falls Bridge	PA 322 to CR 179	Widen	X	X	X					0.0
52	I-95 at Scoudenville Falls Bridge	PA 322 to CR 179	Widen	X	X	X					0.0
53	I-95 at Scoudenville Falls Bridge	PA 322 to CR 179	Widen	X	X	X					0.0
54	I-95 at Scoudenville Falls Bridge	PA 322 to CR 179	Widen	X	X	X					0.0
55	I-95 at Scoudenville Falls Bridge	PA 322 to CR 179	Widen	X	X	X					0.0
56	I-95 at Scoudenville Falls Bridge	PA 322 to CR 179	Widen	X	X	X					0.0
57	I-95 at Scoudenville Falls Bridge	PA 322 to CR 179	Widen	X	X	X					0.0
58	I-95 at Scoudenville Falls Bridge	PA 322 to CR 179	Widen	X	X	X					0.0
59	I-95 at Scoudenville Falls Bridge	PA 322 to CR 179	Widen	X	X	X					0.0
60	I-95 at Scoudenville Falls Bridge	PA 322 to CR 179	Widen	X	X	X					0.0
61	I-95 at Scoudenville Falls Bridge	PA 322 to CR 179	Widen	X	X	X					0.0
62	I-95 at Scoudenville Falls Bridge	PA 322 to CR 179	Widen	X	X	X					0.0
63	I-95 at Scoudenville Falls Bridge	PA 322 to CR 179	Widen	X	X	X					0.0
64	I-95 at Scoudenville Falls Bridge	PA 322 to CR 179	Widen	X	X	X					0.0
65	I-95 at Scoudenville Falls Bridge	PA 322 to CR 179	Widen	X	X	X					0.0